

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

A “New Sheet” is attached, which includes new Fig. 1A. The figure has been added to address the objection to the drawings under 37 C.F.R. §1.83(a).

Fig. 1A is clearly supported by the application as filed, e.g., at page 5, lines 18-22 thereof. No new matter has been added.

REMARKS

In response to the Final Office Action mailed May 12, 2006, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and entry of this Amendment, which is believed to comply with 37 C.F.R. § 1.116. To further the prosecution of this application, each of the issues raised in the Office Action is addressed herein.

Claims 1-3, 5, 7-20, 22-31, 33, 78-92 and 107-128 were previously pending in this application. Claims 1-3, 5, 7-20, 22-31, 33, 78-92, 107 and 108 are allowed. Claims 109-121 and 126-128 stand rejected. Claims 122-125 are withdrawn.

By this amendment, claims 109-128 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer, such that only allowed claims 1-3, 5, 7-20, 22-31, 33, 78-92, 107 and 108 remain pending.

Applicants do not concede that the prior art rejections of claims 109-121 and 126-128 are proper, and respectfully traverse these rejections. Applicants have canceled the non-allowed claims solely to accelerate prosecution towards allowance. Applicants reserve the right to pursue the subject matter of the canceled claims in one or more related (e.g., continuation) applications.

Objections to the Drawings

The drawings are objected to under 37 C.F.R. §1.83(a) as allegedly failing to show every feature specified in the claims. In particular, the Office Action alleges that each of claims 84, 118, 119, and 126-128 specifies at least one feature not shown in the drawings.

Claims 118, 119 and 126-128 have been cancelled. Accordingly the objections to the drawings in connection with these claims are now moot.

In connection with claim 84, the Office Action states that “the system wherein the controller is disposed within the processor” must be shown in the drawings or canceled from the claims. Fig. 1A has been added to address the objection, and is clearly supported by the application as filed, e.g., at page 5, lines 18-22 thereof. In addition, the specification has been amended to include reference to Fig. 1A. No new matter has been added.

In view of the foregoing, withdrawal of the objections to the drawings is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, this application should now be in condition for allowance. A notice to this effect is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes, after this amendment, that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the Applicants' attorney at the telephone number listed below to discuss any further issues relating to the allowability of this application.

If this response is not considered timely filed and if a request for an extension of time is otherwise absent, Applicant hereby requests any necessary extension of time. If there is a fee occasioned by this response, including an extension fee, that is not covered by an enclosed check, please charge any deficiency to **Deposit Account No. 23/2825**, Reference Docket No. **C1104.70000US00**.

Dated: July 10, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By: /Joseph Teja, Jr./

Joseph Teja, Jr., Reg. No. 45,157
Melissa A. Beede, Reg. No. 54,986
WOLF, GREENFIELD & SACKS, P.C.
Federal Reserve Plaza
600 Atlantic Avenue
Boston, Massachusetts 02210-2206
(617) 646-8000